

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending and currently under examination. Claims 13-23 are rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, and under 35 USC §101 as not being a proper process claim.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 5,918,018 (“Gooderum”) in view of Berners-Lee. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 5,918,018 (“Gooderum”) in view of Berners-Lee, and in further view of USP 6,064,723 (“Cohn”). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 5,918,018 (“Gooderum”) in view of Berners-Lee, and in further view of US Publication 20090037991 (“Ellis”).

Claims 5, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 5,918,018 (“Gooderum”) in view of USP 5,774,551 (“Wu”). Claims 6, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 5,918,018 (“Gooderum”) in view of USP 5,774,551 (“Wu”) and in further view of USP 6,208,040 (“Acton”). Claims 11-23 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 5,918,018 (“Gooderum”) in view of USP 5,421,011 (“Camilone”).

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 USC §101 as claiming the same subject matter as USP 6,647,422.

Applicants and the undersigned thank the examiner for the courtesy of an in-person interview on July 9, 2009. At the interview, Chris Coley, one of the named inventors, was present along with Examiner Bathia. Mr. Coley related the background of the invention, and the state of the web server art at the time of the invention. No agreement was reached.

To focus prosecution, Applicants have cancelled claims 9-23 and reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the cancelled claims in a continuation application.

In particular, the remaining independent claims have been amended to more particularly recite the subject matter of claim 6, namely the compiling and linking of a defaults file. The independent claims have also been amended to more clearly point out that the data structure being compiled and linked is the defaults file as related in the specification.

The specification provides support for these amendments at paragraph [0029]:

[0029] The defaults table of FIG. 3 serves as the foundation of a modular framework that allows extensions to the Web server to be easily added so as to run natively as part of the Web server. In one embodiment, extensions are added by modifying the source code file containing the defaults table, to add a new row to the table, for example, or to modify an existing row. A new module having new capabilities might be substituted for an existing module, for example. The defaults file is then recompiled and linked to the Web server.

Paragraph [0030] continues:

[0030] Hence, a mechanism is established that allows modules to be added without the need to rebuild the entire Web server. In accordance with this mechanism, adding an additional server feature involves the following steps:

1. Edit the defaults file (the list of processes) and add an entry for the specific file extension. Add the procedure name to be used for processing this new type. Add an "#include" file defining the procedure at the beginning of the defaults table.
2. Write the procedure. The procedural call to the process will pass two parameters: a File Descriptor to send output to; and a file Name of the document/file to process. The procedure should be written accordingly.
3. Compile the procedure, link it into the Web server, and test.

It is respectfully submitted that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest compiling and linking a file to a web server as now claimed. The process of allowing modules to be added without the need to rebuild the entire Web server is believed to be novel.

Regarding the §112, second paragraph, rejection, the subject claims have been cancelled, rendering the rejection moot.

Regarding the double patenting rejection, it is believed that the newly-presented amendments recite subject matter not present in the claims of the '422 patent, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be removed.

Accordingly, it is respectfully believed that citer art does not teach or suggest such a dynamically-updating web server. It is requested that the instant application be reconsidered in light of these remarks and moved to allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this application or this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 775-848-5624.

Respectfully submitted,  
LEWIS AND ROCA LLP

Dated: August 18, 2009

/timothy a. brisson/

Timothy A. Brisson  
Reg. No.: 44,046

LEWIS AND ROCA LLP  
1663 Hwy 395, Suite 201  
Minden, NV 89423  
(775) 586-9500